THE RICHMOND DISPATCH

BY THE DISPATCH COMPANY.

The DAILY DISPATCH is delivered to subscribers at FIFTEEN CENTS per week, payable to the carrier weekly. Mailed at $6 per annum; $3 for six months; $1.50 for three months; 50c. for one month.

The SEMI-WEEKLY DISPATCH at $2 per annum, or $1 for six months.

The WEEKLY DISPATCH at $1 per annum.

Subscriptions in all cases payable in advance, and no paper continued after the expiration of the time paid for. Send post-office money-order, check, or registered letter. Currency sent by mail will be at the risk of the sender. Subscribers wishing their post-office changed must give their old as well as their new post-office. Sample copies free.

ADVERTISING RATES.
HALF INCH OR LESS.

1 time	$ 50
2 times	1 00
3 times	1 50
6 times	2 70
12 times	5 20
18 times	9 88
1 month	25 00
3 months	

Reading notices in reading-matter type, 5 lines or less, $1; in nonpareil leaded, 75 cents.

Card of rates for more space furnished on application.

All letters and telegrams must be addressed to THE DISPATCH COMPANY.

Rejected communications will not be returned.

TUESDAY............APRIL 28, 1885.

Line upon Line.

Letters we have received make it proper for us to say again that all the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States rendered last week were negative in their character. No decision has been rendered which makes it the duty of any collector of taxes or of any other State officer to receive coupons for taxes. The decisions went as far as any United States court will ever go, yet they went only so far as to say that if the tax-payer tendered coupons in payment of his taxes, the collecting officers could not afterwards levy upon his property to pay the same tax. This was very different from deciding that the collecting officers must receive the coupons.

Let us repeat what we said upon this point last week:

1. There is no law under which coupons can be presented at the treasury for redemption. All the talk about rushing coupons into the treasury is based upon a mistaken idea, or is careless talk.

2. There is no decision of any court, Federal or State, under which coupons can be redeemed at the treasury.

3. Not one dollar of coupons can ever get into the treasury unless voluntarily paid to some collecting officer by a tax-payer.

Now, we will add that the coupons must be genuine, just as the gold or silver coins, or greenbacks, or bank-notes, must be genuine. When the court says that a tender of coupons relieves the tax-payer from liability to levy, it means as to coupons just what it would mean as to bank-notes were it to say that a tender of bank-notes relieves the tax-payer from liability to levy. In other words, the coupons, greenbacks, bank-notes, or gold or silver coins, must be genuine. Read Mr. Justice MATTHEWS's words as taken down by our own reporter:

"As we have seen, the coupon-holder WHO HAS TENDERED GENUINE COUPONS and has been refused, stands on the same basis in this respect as if he had tendered gold coin with a like result."

A correspondent, who says that our leader of last Saturday expressed very clearly the duty of all patriotic tax-payers, adds that before the late decisions of the United States Supreme Court, there were corporations and wealthy citizens who availed themselves of the privilege to tender coupons in payment of their taxes, and says that to him, under the decision of the court referred to, it would appear that they now can do so without any sort of hinderance whatever.

Of course this is a misunderstanding. The Auditor will require all collecting officers to receive none but genuine coupons. If counterfeit ones are received either at the treasury or by the collecting officers the party or parties receiving them will be the loser.

We must repeat that the RIDDLEBERGER bill was not touched by the late decisions of the Supreme Court. The bondholders, if they are wise, will proceed at once to fund under that bill.

But it is said that the whole of the act of January 26, 1882, and of the amendatory act of March 14, 1884, has been pronounced unconstitutional. True enough; but that decision merely remits the State to her natural rights. She has now no law prescribing a method of proving coupons to be genuine. Nor has she any law prescribing a method of proving bank-notes, or greenbacks, or gold or silver coins, to be genuine. But she has the right—unquestionable right—to reject all coupons, all bank-notes, all greenbacks, all gold or silver coins, which are not genuine. Every county treasurer who comes to Richmond to settle with the Auditor must bring either genuine money or genuine coupons.

But above all is the indisputable fact that not one dollar of coupons can get into the treasury unless paid in voluntarily by some tax-payer. If the people of Virginia desire to be rid of the debt question—if they wish to have all the outstanding bonds funded under the RIDDLEBERGER bill—all they have to do is to persist for one or two more years in paying their taxes in money. The State is obliged to have money, and if you pay in coupons you will lose as much in the end as you will gain in the beginning.

The State, let us say once more, is still master of the situation.

Bradstreet's is a cautious paper. In its last issue it very modestly says as to the decisions in the Virginia cases:

"The doctrine now held by the court appears to be in substance that while the State of Virginia has made a valid contract with the coupon-holders, yet that the Federal courts have no power to interfere aggressively to compel the performance by the State of its contract, though the power of those courts can be interposed to defend the other contracting party (the coupon-holder) against compulsory process of the State, after he has performed the contract on his part. These last decisions will certainly afford some degree of protection to the bondholders, and will give at least a negative value to the coupons."

Why couldn't JOHN A. HAMBLETON & Co. see as clear as *Bradstreet's*? "Negative value" is good. "Some degree of protection," quotha!

Shameful Misrepresentation.

The articles in the New York *Tribune* on the Virginia debt question are a disgrace to journalism. Here, for example, is one of its downright falsehoods. That paper says:

"The latest scheme of the Bourbons is to call a State convention, and solemnly resolve the old State out of existence, leaving no corporate entity to be responsible for the payment of any bonds or interest thereon."

"But the question would even then arise whether Virginia, or any new organization of the same material, could claim any of the rights and powers of a State. If it is a State at all, it is Virginia, and has a debt; if it is not the State of Virginia, it is entitled to no representation in the Electoral College, in the Senate, or in the House."

The above is a falsehood having not a shadow of foundation. Nobody in Virginia has ever proposed so absurd a scheme. The *Tribune* cannot, to save its reputation for veracity, cite the authority of any Virginian or Virginia paper for its false statement. It was based, of course, upon the proposition to assess the State taxes upon the counties instead of upon property. But surely anybody not an idiot can understand that in order to the success of this scheme, (which we have not endorsed,) there must be a State government to enforce it—a Governor, a Legislature, a judiciary, and all other needed State officers. It would require a strong State government to carry out that scheme.

But the *Tribune* is letting out its malice. It seeks to arouse northern prejudice against the Democratic Administration by denouncing the people of Virginia as repudiators. Here is a specimen of that paper's decency:

"Virginia, however, will be obliged to recognize the fact that the law is no respecter of persons, and the Constitution of the United States cannot be set aside with impunity, even by the first families of Virginia."

"In some fashion, however, the Bourbons intend to resist the authority of the United States, if they can. Next, the President will have to decide whether he will encourage and countenance those who defy the Constitution of the United States by appointing any of them to office. Men can be found in Virginia to hold all the offices who are staunch and uncompromising debt-payers. The President will either choose such men in any future appointments for Virginia, or he will make the cause of the repudiators his own."

That is enough. It is disgusting. It tells just what Republican journalism in New York is. The people of Virginia claim the protection of the Federal Constitution, quoting its emphatic provision that no State shall be sued as Virginia has been sued, and the above tirade is the *Tribune's* answer to that appeal. The slang of the street is substituted for the argument of the journalist.

But think of a Republican journal talking about appointing to office "staunch and uncompromising debt-payers"! MAHONE and ARTHUR filled the Federal offices in Virginia with friends of the coupon-killing bill which the *Tribune* is now denouncing!

But it is useless to expect justice to any southern State or southern Democrat at the hands of JAY GOULD'S organ. It belongs to Wall street, and is, therefore, but a toothless hag. It cannot bite anybody.

College Athletics.

The Philadelphia *Evening Telegraph*, in an article commending the systematic course of gymnastic training given at one of the institutions of learning of Pennsylvania, says that "mind and body are, indeed, so interdependent that it is folly to expect to administer to one unless the best care is taken of the other. And," it adds, "in like manner is it folly to allow young people to indulge in violent exercise without the control of matured and skilled judgment. The haphazard work of the gymnasium has done more harm than good." True, and the students and authorities of our colleges and universities would do well to heed the above points. The time from now until commencement is the season in which students generally put in some of their heaviest athletic work, and it behooves college authorities to do everything in their power to see that this work is conducted systematically and not under too great a strain. Even though a college professor may not be competent to outline a proper course of training, if he be popular his presence on the ball-field, in the gymnasium, or at the rowing reach will exercise a salutary influence. While many young men have been built up by college athletics, many have been ruined by them. In fact, it generally happens that the strongest men physically are the most indiscreet and most liable, if not checked, to over-exertion. It is a good rule for both professors and students to watch the "brag-men" especially.

One of the consequences of the decision as rendered by the majority of the court is that West Virginia will be held liable for one third of the original bonded debt of the old Commonwealth, as she was then a part and parcel of Virginia.—*Louisville Post.*

Oh, no. West Virginia has nothing to do with the decision. The court has decided nothing as to Virginia bonds, nor as to the State debt proper. We can repudiate those bonds or this debt whenever we please. The decision was simply that if a tax-payer had tendered coupons in payment of his taxes, the collecting officer could not afterwards levy upon his property to satisfy that particular tax. The United States Supreme Court does not pretend to claim the power to compel a State to pay its debts, though JAY GOULD'S organ seems to think it does.

His present publishers print his name on the title-page of his books, without so much as an intermediary comma, "Alfred Lord Tennyson." It is safe to surmise that Alfred Lord is writing the alleged poems recently and cruelly attributed to Tennyson.—*New York World.*

"A true bill, my Lord."

Misunderstandings.

Although in 1881 the nominees for Governor and Attorney-General were both taken from the south side of the James river, there is still a prevalent impression in that grand division of the State that the Democrats there have habitually been slighted. We publish this morning a letter from Mr. ATKINS on that subject. We published last week a similar complaint from the Southwest. We have also published one of a somewhat similar nature from the Valley (Seventh district). People almost unavoidably look at every such matter from their own point of view, and seldom follow CHARLES READE'S advice, "Put yourself in his place."

Therefore, we publish Mr. ATKINS'S and other such letters. It is indispensably necessary that there should be a perfect understanding (instead of misunderstandings) between the Democrats of the various sections of Virginia, and we can think of no other method of accomplishing that end so likely to succeed as the policy of letting each section know what the other sections consider their grievances. We are bound to own that Mr. ATKINS makes out a strong case; and yet the strong letter of "Candor," which we also publish to-day, comes from a county adjoining Mr. ATKINS'S.

BRIEF COMMENT.

The Canadian troops have had some RIEL fighting, and do not think there is so much fun in the campaign after all.

The disposition of the press is to take Chaplain PEPPER'S story of his alleged interview with General LEE with a good deal of salt.

"Louisville, according to the newspapers, has had a shower of angle-worms." That must be a pretty "bad form of 'em to have."

"Senator SHERMAN reiterates his intention not to run for any office now." JOHN evidently knows that the country has had enough of him.

Senator SHERMAN, says a telegram to the Philadelphia *Press*, is willing to leave political life. Senator SHERMAN has the public's permission to do so.

"There are signs of a dissolution of the senatorial deadlock in Illinois." "Dissolution of the deadlock" is good. Three or four members of the Legislature have died.

"Two bruisers are to spar for the benefit of the BARTHOLDI fund." Why not? Does not the *World* maintain that it is the duty of every one to "spar" for that object?

Our Congressmen and the Offices.

SOUTH BOSTON, HALIFAX CO., VA.,
April 25, 1885.

To the Editor of the Dispatch:

The writer has read with close attention the criticisms of the press upon the recent conferences of our congressmen, who met to consider the disposition of Federal offices, and also with much interest the many communications appearing in your paper from various portions of the State relative to that matter. I dislike to occupy your valuable space, but feel impelled almost by a sense of duty to take issue with the assailants (the word is used in no harsh sense) of our representatives, and especially because I have looked in vain for replies to some very harsh and unjust criticisms. I trust you will extend "the other side" an opportunity to be heard.

In the inception of this discussion it appeared to me singular, to say the least, that such extreme views of the action of our representatives should be entertained by so many of our party leaders. I hold to that opinion still; for, with all due respect to those who disagree with me, no sound reason has yet been advanced to justify the attacks or to prove our congressmen acting beyond their authority and without ample license. Nay, further, it does not appear that they have overstepped in the least the bounds of prudence or discretion.

The question of "spoils," vulgarly so styled, is one of the most difficult of management that confronts a newly-victorious party. It is one which the astute politician has found to be ever pregnant with dangers to his success and honeycombed with pitfalls for his hopes. A congressman in appointing a constituent to an office for which twenty constituents apply generally gains *one* friend and enjoys the blissful reflection of having made nineteen very firm and very lively enemies. This is undoubtedly true. None gainsay it. It is manifest, therefore, that the most mediocre of our statesmen must at once see the danger presented to individual ambition, and therefore greatly prefer relief and freedom from these demands upon his official position and influence as an aid in securing Government employment. All do see it, and the majority would gladly avoid the responsibility of endorsing applications and making recommendations. There is no way, however, by which this can be done. In the very nature of things congressmen are relied upon by the Administration for advice—instruction, might I say?—in the appointments accredited to their districts and States. Were they to remain silent and flatly refuse to take part in the distribution of offices, what a chorus of clamorings would be heard! What sneers upon their lack of "backbone" and proper appreciation of their duty to aid and protect their constituents. No, the congressman cannot avoid this question. He cannot escape its dangers, be he never so wise. He must, of necessity, steer his barque as best he may between the Scylla of numerous disappointed office-seekers, angered at their defeat, and the Charybdis of absolute neutrality concerning the demands of his people. It is not a peaceful channel, but it must be sailed.

Taking this view of the question, I hold, with many others, that the Democratic congressmen of Virginia have not superseded their rights as individuals and private citizens; have done nothing improper, indiscreet, or dictatorial as public servants. Nay, rather they seem to have met a great responsibility without weak hesitation—bravely, squarely, and patriotically.

The only objection that has been urged—that *can* be urged—against the recent conferences is that there is a probability of personal favorites and henchmen of the representatives reaping all the rewards to the exclusion of others more deserving. If this is really the opinion of the people regarding John W. Daniel, George C. Cabell, George D. Wise, John S. Barbour, John Ran. Tucker, Thomas Croxton, Connally F. Trigg, and Charles T. O'Ferrall, then I say the people of Virginia ought never to have elected them to the high and honorable positions they now occupy. But surely this is not the real sentiment of the masses. I do not believe it, and unless it *is* their settled conclusion the charge of dictatorship falls to the ground, for this, as before stated, is the *only* ground of complaint, and, it may be added, has so far been entirely imaginary and not susceptible of proof, nor, indeed, of any tangible substantiation whatever in actual fact.

All this talk of "bosses" is bosh. No man is debarred from filing his application with his district representative, and thus with the conference, nor of pressing his claims upon the appointing power of the Administration. In both events the probabilities are that his petition will receive all the consideration it merits. If he happens not to possess the influence and prominence of other competitors, it is his own misfortune, and not his congressman's fault.

The meetings held by our representatives and the course they have taken appear to me eminently reasonable. By discussion and conference, by organization and concerted action, just recognition by the Administration is more surely secured; an equable distribution of the offices among the various districts and deserving Democrats is undoubtedly more assured, with less cause for complaint than would arise in a free, go-as-you-please race, where conflicting interests, not harmonized, would surely work great dissatisfaction and dissension.

In conclusion, I do not believe our congressmen wished or intended to strengthen their hands by any system of favoritism. If in these conferences they have attempted such a thing they have pursued a most remarkable and illogical means to their end. Their sole desire was, in my humble opinion, to better serve their various constituencies and secure all the Government patronage they could for the State at large.

Let me add that I am not and do not expect to be a candidate for official honors, and therefore cannot be charged with being "one of the favorites."

Yours truly, CANDOR.

Our Congressmen in "Caucus," and Their Action in Washington.

To the Editor of the Dispatch:

I have read the communications of your several correspondents of late upon the recent action of our Virginia congressional delegation in regard to the appointment of Federal officers in our State, and I am satisfied that the authors are not only ignorant of the subject they treat, but do gross injustice to the congressmen whose conduct they assail.

They seem to think it was an arrogant and unwarranted assumption on their part of the right to divide the spoils among themselves by dictating who should or should not be appointed to the several offices in the State, and that their meetings were conducted on the "star-chamber" or "secret-caucus" order, in utter contempt of the rights and wishes and interests of office-seekers and their constituents at home.

Now, I know something about the whole matter myself, because I was there, and I know that the whole purpose, motive, and action of the members of Congress have been grossly misrepresented in this regard. What are the real facts?

The Virginia delegation did not hold their first caucus until the 17th of March, which was many days after the members from all the other States had held their caucuses, made their nominations, and gone home. Their meeting was not an unusual one because it was just what has been done for long years by the members of Congress from every State, and the only known mode by which the public sentiment and wishes of the people of a State can be conveniently concentrated and expressed in such matters; nor was there anything secret about their meeting or action, for both the time and place were known to every applicant, and every applicant or his friends were *invited* to be present with his papers, and to make a full statement of his case, and every applicant by himself or through his right friend, to my personal knowledge, *did* appear and make his own application in his own way and manner and in cheerful accord with the plan; for it is only the friends of those who failed to get the endorsement of a majority of the delegation who make these complaints of the caucus or its action. There was not, and is not now, an applicant in the State who would not be glad to go before President Cleveland and his Cabinet with his papers endorsed by the entire delegation, nor is there an applicant with three grains of common sense who would venture before the President for office without the endorsement, at least, of his own member of Congress, and if his own member, why not all of them, if he can get them? And how was it possible for all the eight members to sign for more than *one* person for the *same* office without stultifying themselves and destroying their influence with the President? Or how was it possible for the members to have made their applications effective for any one applicant if they had been divided themselves among a half dozen or more candidates for the same position? Suppose, for instance, that each member had signed singly for an applicant from each district for the same office, how would the President have decided such a case? He would have said at once: "Gentlemen, you are divided radically among yourselves and your representatives, who ought to know you and the wishes of your people. I can't appoint but one of you to the same office, and as you and your representatives are not united among yourselves there is no use for me to further divide you by appointing one against all the others, and thus offend the multitude. I will let the present incumbents hold on." And how was it possible for our members of Congress to have had any united or systematic action upon such a matter without a meeting somewhere?

Besides, it is well known that our marshals and revenue collection districts run into and embrace several of the congressional districts, and it is well known that each congressional district had one or more applicants of its own for these several offices. How were the members to harmonize among themselves except by a caucus and harmonious agreement? Some of the applicants had to be beaten and some of the districts left out in the cold. How was that to be done with harmony without mutual agreement among the members and the contending parties as to how the division should be made and each section and district satisfied?

It is not true, as represented by your correspondent "Citizen," that the congressional delegation assumed the "regal powers conferred on Mahone by Arthur," and undertook to make "*appointments*" of their own or to "dictate" them to the President and his Cabinet. Their whole action was simply *recommendatory*, just as all other endorsements of political papers are, and would have been, if signed in a different way; nor did they pretend to represent or to suppose that their recommendations were equivalent to an "appointment" or binding on the President, nor to deny to any dissatisfied applicant the unquestionable right to "row his own boat" and make his own application in his own way to the appointing power, if he preferred to do so. They knew very well that the President has rejected a number of candidates *unanimously* recommended by the congressional delegations of other States, and it would have been silly in them to have supposed that they would, in all cases, have been more potential than other State delegations in their recommendations.

The naked truth of the whole matter is that the part our congressmen have taken in this whole matter was purely a thankless, laborious, and costly one to best serve their people who wanted office and needed their help to get it. They went to Washington, and have been there, off and on, for nearly two months, at their own personal expense of not less than eight or ten dollars a day, and to the neglect of important private business at home, and they have been besieged and worked day and night as never slaves were worked to serve applicants to the best of their ability. Some of them have absolutely been compelled now and then to change their lodging-rooms in order to get the rest and sleep which tired nature absolutely requires of the strongest. Does any sensible man suppose that members of Congress would endure all of this annoyance, expense, and labor just for the fun of it? And suppose these members had all sulked at home in their ease and have given no service to their people hunting office in Washington, would they not have been unfaithful to their representative trust and ungrateful to their friends who have helped them fight their battles? And would not curses loud and deep have been heaped upon them by the very "sore heads" who now misrepresent and abuse them for simply discharging their duty in fidelity to their people and friends?

Those who are not satisfied with what our congressmen have done, and are doing for them, ought to take their papers to the President and his Cabinet and see what they will do over and above what has been done for them. Of course, only *one* can get the same office, and the trial of such an experiment can only result as this has done—those who are lucky enough to get his diploma from the President will be delighted, while the ten or more who fail will cuss President Cleveland and his Cabinet for want of gratitude, just as the friends of those who have failed to get the unanimous endorsement from the "congressional caucus" have cussed their thankless representatives.

LYNCHBURG, VA. R. H. G.

[For the Dispatch.]

To the Democrats of the Fourth and Second Congressional Districts.

As the time for the meeting of the Democratic State Convention is rapidly approaching, it behooves us to take counsel together and consider if it is not possible to devise some means of placing the counties in Virginia which are unfortunately dominated by negro majorities upon terms of equality with the more favored white counties. That the Democrats in these minority counties have from 1869 to the present time been mere "hewers of wood and drawers of water" in the Democratic camp none will be so hardy as to deny. Since 1869 the Democrats have elected a majority of the Legislature six times. The elected Democratic candidates for the Legislature form themselves into a caucus, and proceed to nominate candidates for all offices to be filled by the Legislature, and to fix and determine the policy to be pursued by the party on all important questions of legislation. Thus nearly half of the Democrats in the State have absolutely no voice in selecting their candidates for United States senators, basement officers, judges, &c., or in shaping the policy upon important questions of legislation, for which their party is to be held responsible. And being unrepresented, they have been ignored and neglected.

Of the United States senators, secretaries of the Commonwealth, auditors, treasurers, railroad commissioners, superintendents of penitentiary and of public instruction, &c., elected by these six Legislatures, how many have been taken from that one-fifth part of the State embraced in the Second and Fourth congressional districts and comprising the bulk of the Black Belt? Not one so far as the writer can now recall, while they would in fairness have been entitled to twelve or fifteen.

But this is not all or the worst. Even in legislation the only idea seems to have been to relieve the counties having Democratic majorities, without reference to the others. Numberless instances could be given, but I will only take time to name one and the latest—the bill for the assessment of lands, Acts Special Session, 1884, page 113.

The old law provided that the county courts should appoint the assessors, but the Mahone Legislature having elected Republican judges, most of whom were still in office, the Democratic members of the last Legislature went to work to prevent Republican assessors being appointed in their own counties, and succeeded admirably. They provided that the assessors should be appointed by a board composed of the county judge, county clerk, and Commonwealth's attorney. This was all right for the Democratic counties, as of course their clerks and Commonwealth's attorneys, being elective officers, would be Democrats, and thus give them a majority of the board. But how was it for us? All clerks and Commonwealth's attorneys in Republican counties are Republicans; in fact, in a great many counties this bright scheme resulted in the selection of Republican assessors, where otherwise Democrats would have been appointed, as a number of judges, from change of party, having been elected to fill vacancies, and other causes, were Democrats and would have appointed Democratic assessors, but being outvoted by their Republican associates on the board has to assist in appointing Republican assessors, where they would otherwise have appointed Democrats.

Can it be possible that these legislators did not have genius enough to fall upon some plan to relieve their brethren in Republican counties while taking care of themselves; or if they could not do this, might they not have been willing to bear this little burden with us until we could all be relieved together? It was but a mite compared to what we have undergone for the last fifteen years. But it has been 'ever thus' courted and petted when our votes are needed, and forgotten when the battle is over. But, notwithstanding all this, the whites of the Black Belt have ever been true to their party, and under the lead of such patriots as John Goode, L. R. Watts, R. C. Marshall, Phil. McKinney, George E. Rives, and others, have stood on election-day in the Democratic column like a *stone wall*, and polled votes which should bring the blush to the cheek of their brethren of more favored sections. Let us illustrate: In the last election the Second district, with a *white voting population* of 18,745, gave Cleveland 13,652 votes, or 72 per cent. The Fourth district—white voting population, 13,790; Cleveland, 10,326, or 80 per cent. Seventh district—white voting population, 26,568; Cleveland, 15,790, or 59 per cent. Ninth district—white voting population, 28,068; Cleveland, 13,844, or 49 per cent. Suppose the Second and Fourth districts had voted like the Seventh and Ninth, what would have been the Democratic majority in the State? Yet, thanks to hard work and all doing the best we could, the State was saved and Cleveland elected, and now we have some more of the beauties of the caucus system without minority representation. The eight Democratic congressmen assemble in conference to dispense the Federal patronage; they *dispense* all the general offices to their own districts, and now propose to dispose of the local offices in all the districts, including the Second and Fourth.

Can any human being give a sensible reason why R. C. Marshall, who received the solid Democratic vote of his district and was defeated by the accident or misfortune of having a negro majority against him, should not have as much voice in dispensing patronage in Virginia as a congressman from another district who was elected by the accident or good fortune of having no negroes in his district? Can any good reason be given why the 1,353 Democrats of Nansemond have not as good right to a voice in nominating to the Legislature a candidate for United States senator, or State Auditor, as the 895 of Pulaski, or why the 1,695 of Mecklenburg have not as good right to be heard as the 844 of Spotsylvania?

All must admit that this condition of affairs is not equitable and just, and the only question should be, Is there any remedy for the wrong? I think there is one, plain and simple. Resolutions will be introduced in the State convention *demanding* that in every legislative party caucus all regularly nominated Democratic candidates for the Legislature, whether elected or defeated, shall be entitled to seats and to vote; that in all conferences of Virginia congressmen held with a view to making recommendations for appointment to Federal offices in Virginia all regularly nominated Democratic candidates for Congress, whether elected or defeated, shall be entitled to participate, and asking the President and heads of departments to give as much weight to the recommendations of defeated Democratic candidates for Congress as to those elected. Should these resolutions be incorporated in the platform it will go far towards removing all cause of complaint in the party, and the Democrats in the Republican counties, who have been fighting so long against such fearful odds, will go into the fight with renewed zeal and energy in behalf of a cause which they love so well.

I know it will be said that such questions as this ought not to be raised, that it will disturb the harmony of the party. *This is all bosh*, and has been the cry for the last fifteen years. If the grievances to which I have referred are imaginary, then there is nothing to redress. If they are real, then there should be none to oppose, as a party would be totally unworthy of support which would desire to continue to treat its own friends with injustice.

No meaner or more contemptible political sin can be committed than for men to sulk or desert their party because they don't get all they want or think they are entitled to; but surely we have the right to stand up in our own party—*it is our party*—and demand equal rights and a community of interest.

Should you agree with me as to the policy and propriety of this movement, then send delegates to the State convention pledged to see that these resolutions are not pigeon holed or buried in committee, but that they are incorporated in the platform.

I do not presume to be a leader in this movement—I am but an humble private in the ranks—but I am ready to strike hands with you, and *not to ask* but to *demand* full, perfect, and absolute equality in the Democratic brotherhood.

WILLIAM T. ATKINS.

Boydton, April 25, 1885.

MEETINGS.

HEADQUARTERS RICHMOND COMMANDERY, No. 2, K. T., RICHMOND, April 28, 1885. GENERAL ORDERS, No. 114.—SIR KNIGHTS: Attend a stated assembly of the Commandery at the Asylum (St. Albans Hall) THIS (Tuesday) EVENING at 7½ o'clock in fatigue dress.

Members of other commanderies are invited to unite with us.

By order of the Eminent Commander,
ALFRED R. COURTNEY,
Captain-General.
Attest: S. McG. FISHER, Recorder.
ap 28-1t*

VIRGINIA COUNCIL, No. 2, ORDER OF CHOSEN FRIENDS.—The members of VIRGINIA COUNCIL, No. 2, are requested to attend a regular meeting at their hall, Fifth and Marshall streets, THIS (Tuesday) EVENING, April 28th, at 8 o'clock. A full attendance is desired.
By order of C. C. S. B. JACOBS,
ap 28-1t Secretary.

OFFICE OF HOLLYWOOD CEMETERY CO.,
RICHMOND, VA., April 25, 1885.
THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE STOCKHOLDERS OF HOLLYWOOD CEMETERY COMPANY will be held at the office of the Virginia State Insurance Company, No. 1008 Main street, on TUESDAY, May 5, 1885, at 5 o'clock P. M.
R. T. BROOKE,
ap 26-td Treasurer.

ADJOURNED MEETING.—An adjourned meeting of the STOCKHOLDERS OF THE RICHMOND, FREDERICKSBURG AND POTOMAC RAILROAD COMPANY will be held on TUESDAY, April 28, 1885, at 12 o'clock M.
J. B. WINSTON,
ap 22-W&Tu2t Secretary.

MILITARY NOTICES.

HEADQUARTERS STUART HORSE GUARDS.—GENERAL ORDERS, No. —.—The Troop will assemble on TUESDAY EVENING, April 28th, on drill-ground (west Clay street) at 5:30 o'clock in full-dress uniform and leggings—arms and accoutrements in perfect order. It is very important to have every member present, if possible.
By command of Lieutenant F. H. DRANE.
CHARLES EUKER,
ap 28-1t Acting Orderly.

AMUSEMENTS.

DIME MUSEUM.

FAREWELL WEEK AND LAST WEEK OF THE SEASON.

The celebrated drama, in six acts,
THE TWO ORPHANS,
a touching and thrilling story told with marvellous effect.
The pretty and talented actress,
ARNE WALKER,
in her great impersonation of
LOUISE, THE BLIND GIRL.
Irwin Walker, Lucile Allen Walker, and a superb dramatic cast.
Don't forget, the last week of the season.

Admission to all, only 10 cents; reserved seats, 20 cents—to be had at C. F. Johnston's, 918 Main street. Doors open afternoon 1:30; commences at 2:30. Night, open at 7; commences at 8:15. ap 26

THE THOMAS ARTISTS' CONCERT.
TUESDAY, MAY 5, 1885.
(8¼ o'clock P. M.)
MOZART HALL.

The following distinguished artists will appear:

Soprano	Miss EMMA JUCH.
Tenor	Mr. WM. J. WINCH.
Contralto	Miss HATTIE J. CLAPPER.
Basso	Mr. MAX HEINRICH.
Piano Virtuoso	Mr. CARL FAELTEN.
Accompanist	Mr. MAX HEINRICH.

A programme of rare artistic merit may be expected. The celebrated Wm. Knabe & Co's. Pianos used; Richmond agency at RAMOS & MOSES'.

General admission, $1; no extra charge for reserved seats.

Box-sheet at RAMOS & MOSES' Music-House on and after May 2d, (next SATURDAY.) ap 26

BOOK AND JOB PRINTING NEATLY EXECUTED AT THE DISPATCH PRINTING-HOUSE.

MARRIAGES.

BRIGGS—WALTER.—Married, April 21, 1885, at the residence of the bride's parents, 415 east Clay street, by the Rev. A. C. Bledsoe, JOHN A. BRIGGS and Miss CARRIE L. WALTER, both of Richmond.

DEATHS.

CANFIELD.—Died, April 26, 1885, at the residence of his father, in Henrico county, JOHN SEDDON CANFIELD; aged ten years and twenty-six days.

Oh, my little JOHNNY,
He has gone so far away;
He has gone to Heaven with angels
And with our Father to stay.
We miss him at the table,
We miss him everywhere;
But when our Father called him
Of course we must bear.
HIS MOTHER.